

REMARKS

In the above-identified Office Action all of the claims were rejected as being obvious in view of various combinations of references. All of such rejections rely on the cited Ueda, Yamada, and Clouthier patents, while the rejection of Claim 3 relies also on “well known prior art”, and that of Claim 4 relies also on the cited Kim patent.

Although Applicant believes that the claimed invention is patentable over all of those references, independent Claims 1, 9, and 11 have been amended herein to emphasize their patentable distinctions.

The Claimed Invention

In particular, independent Claim 1 requires that if an image area of a predetermined size has a specific type of object, a rendering command is inputted a plurality of times for an identifying step, an obtaining step, a correction step, and a developing step. Claim 1 requires also that if an image area of the predetermined size does not have the specific type of object, the rendering command is inputted one time.

Independent Claims 9 and 11 require analogous features, and these various features are not disclosed in the cited rejecting references.

In addition, Claim 1 now requires a determining step for determining whether the rendering command for an image area of the predetermined size is inputted only one time or a plurality of times for the identifying step, the obtaining step, the correction step, and the developing step based on whether the identifying step determines that an image area of the predetermined size has the specific type of object. Amended Claims 9 and 11 now include similar requirements.

The Inapplicability Of the Cited Prior Art

Unlike the above-characterized requirements of Applicant's claims, the cited Ueda patent is understood to disclose that for all kinds of image data, rendering commands are always inputted twice, first by reading out image data from working memory 14 to determine the different types of images (column 9, lines 1-3 and Figures 3-7), and then by reading out the image data from the image memory 16, processing the read-out image data, storing the processed image data in the memory 14, and then transferring the image data from memory 14 to the printer 24 (column 25, line 62 through column 26, line 38 and Figure 8);

The cited Clouthier patent, on the other hand, is understood to disclose that image data and rendering commands are input into the printer 12 from the host 10 only once, regardless of the type of object that is input, as shown in Figure 1, and as discussed between column 3, line 28 and column 5, line 14 of this patent. Page 6 of the Office Action appears to disagree with this characterization, implying that the rendering commands for raster image data are inputted once, while rendering commands for other kinds of image data are inputted twice: "If the specific type of an object is not identified, said object is assumed to be raster image data (column 3, lines 39-43 of Clouthier). It can therefore directly be part of the received image data (column 4, lines 9-13 of Clouthier), since the object is already in raster format, and therefore does not need image correction commands to be re-input and thus has only to be inputted one time." But, column 3, lines 39-43, merely states that when an incoming data stream is neither text, nor graphics, the identification module 14 assumes that it is raster image data, while column 4, lines 9-13

merely states that after the image data has been identified, it is input into a page build module 16 that performs a raster operation thereon. Thus, these portions of the Clouthier et al. patent do not disclose that rendering commands for image data associated with the identifier "10" (the raster image identifier) are input once, while the rendering commands for other image data are input twice. In addition, Figure 1 shows all kinds of data, including raster data, input from the host processor 10 and the image identifier 14 to the page build module 16 only once. For these reasons, this patent is not understood to teach changing the number of times rendering commands are input, depending on the kinds of image data associated therewith.

The cited Yamada patent is understood to relate to an apparatus and method for: displaying images of a plurality of pages on a monitor laid out with particular positions and orientations, spacings therebetween, and margins; and changing this layout data (the spacing "a" between two rows of pages, and the spacings "b", "c", and "d", between each page in a row), in response to user input with an input device 16, as discussed at page 3, line 65 through page 4, line 55. However, the Yamada patent is silent as to Applicant's claim limitations.

For these reasons it is believed that each of Claims 1, 9, and 11 is patentable over the rejecting references.


Applicant has also added new Claims 13-15 which requires that 1) the identifying step or means determines the types of objects based on the number of bits in the rendering command representing the object, and 2) the determining step or means determines the number of times the rendering command is inputted for an image area of the

predetermined size for the identifying step or means, the obtaining step or means, the correction step or means, and the developing step or means based on the number of bits in the rendering command for the objects in the image area of the predetermined size. In contrast, the cited art does not disclose these features.

For these various reasons it is believed that all of the remaining claims, as now presented, are allowable and a formal Notice of Allowance is solicited.

Applicant's undersigned attorney may be reached in our New York office by telephone at (212) 218-2100. All correspondence should continue to be directed to our new address given below.

Respectfully submitted,



Attorney for Applicant
John A. Krause
Registration No. 24,613

FITZPATRICK, CELLA, HARPER & SCINTO
30 Rockefeller Plaza
New York, New York 10112-3801
Facsimile: (212) 218-2200

NY_MAIN 566234v1